

REMARKS

I. AMENDMENT OF THE TITLE

The Examiner objected to the Title on the ground that it was not descriptive. See February 13, 2004 Non-Final Office Action ("2/13/04 OA"), at p. 2. The Title has been amended, using wording from the original Abstract, to overcome the objection.

II. CONTENT OF THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to various parts of the original Specification ("Cross Reference to Related Applications", "Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development", etc.). Id., at pp. 2-4. The Specification has been amended to delete extraneous parts and comply with conventional U.S. patent formatting. No new matter has been added.

III. 35 USC § 101 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected all the claims on the ground that the application discloses an abstract idea rather than a useful invention. Id., at pp. 4-5. Applicant respectfully submits that the steps recited in the Detailed Description of the Invention

disclose a system to provide an Internet-based rushes footage delivery system that uses potential buyers' geographic location information to restrict delivery of rushes footage content when the content is unallowed for the buyer's location. Moreover, the disclosed system also restricts content based upon the broadcast status of buyers. The Specification describes restricting content based upon the buyer's status as, for example, an advertiser. See Publication US 2003/0037003 A1, at ¶ 0020.

By describing the invention in nine steps, the application will be understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art of setting-up and operating commercial websites. See Publication US 2003/0037003 A1, at ¶¶ 0017-25.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application provides sufficient information to teach a person of ordinary skill in the art of setting-up and operating commercial websites how to create a system to register potential rushes footage buyers and limit access of the content to buyers having allowed geographic or broadcast status.

IV. 35 USC § 112 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected all the claims on the ground that the application fails to comply with the enablement requirement of 35

USC § 112, first paragraph. See 2/13/04 OA, at p. 5. The Examiner argues that Applicant merely discloses a concept without providing the essential steps of the claimed system. The Examiner also rejected the claims, under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on the ground that the claims are written in narrative form. Id.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to set forth and claim the steps recited in the Detailed Description of the Invention. As noted in the section above, Applicant respectfully submits that the steps recited in the Detailed Description of the Invention disclose a system to provide an Internet-based rushes footage delivery system that uses potential buyers' geographic location information to restrict delivery of rushes footage content when the content is unallowed for the buyer's location. Moreover, the disclosed system can also restrict content based upon the broadcast status of buyers. By describing the invention in nine steps, the application will be understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art of setting-up and operating commercial websites. See Publication US 2003/0037003 A1, at ¶¶ 0017-25.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is enabled by the Specification, such that a person of ordinary skill in the art of setting-up and operating commercial websites would understand how to create a system to register potential

rushes footage buyers and limit access of the content to buyers having allowed geographic or broadcast status.

V. 35 USC §102(b) REJECTION

The Examiner rejected all the claims, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,832,496 to Anand, et al. ("Anand"), and by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,746 to Knutson, et al. ("Knutson"). See 2/13/04 OA, ¶ 4, at p. 6. The Anand and Knutson patents stem from the same parent application. These patents relate to a "system and method for performing intelligent analysis and for generating a report". See Anand, Abstract.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to set forth and claim the steps recited in the Detailed Description of the Invention. As noted in the section above, Applicant respectfully submits that the steps recited in the Detailed Description of the Invention disclose a system to provide an Internet-based rushes footage delivery system that uses potential buyers' geographic location information to restrict delivery of rushes footage content when the content is unallowed for the buyer's location. Moreover, the disclosed system can also restrict content based upon the broadcast status of buyers. By describing the invention in nine steps, the application will be understood by persons of

ordinary skill in the art of setting-up and operating commercial websites. See Publication US 2003/0037003 A1, at ¶¶ 0017-25.

The Anand and Knutson patents do not disclose the steps set forth in Applicant's amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Anand or Knutson and is in a condition for allowance.

VI. DRAWINGS

The original application did not include any drawings. This response includes a new Figure 1, which is a block diagram showing the nine steps set forth in the Detailed Description of the Invention. No new matter is added.

VII. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.